

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of October 3, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. The Applicants' undersigned representative is new counsel of record pursuant to the new Power of Attorney filed January 24, 2006. Claims 1, 18 and 38 have been amended. Claims 45 and 46 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-10, 18-21, 38-40, 45 and 46 remain pending after entry of the present amendment and request for continued examination. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the following arguments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-8, 10, 18-21 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tegler *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,481, hereinafter "Tegler"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 1, 18 and 38 all relate to, *inter alia*, first and second signals, received at first and second receivers, respectively, of a terminal, wherein the second signal comprises information complementary to the first signal. In addition, a receiving schedule of the first receiver is determined based on the complementary information of the second signal. Nowhere does Tegler teach or suggest such features. Tegler discloses a set-top box having a GSM component and a broadband receiver component that are both capable of receiving interactive data transmissions. Col. 3, ll. 34-53. In addition, Tegler discloses finding data information in a broadcast channel based on data received over a downlink. Col. 3, ll. 50-53. However, Tegler lacks any teaching or suggestion of determining a receiving schedule of the first receiver based on complementary information of the second signal. More specifically, the set-top-box of Tegler does not determine a *receiving schedule* of the broadband receiver based on information received via the GSM component. Similarly, a receiving schedule of the GSM component is not determined based on information received via the broadband receiver. Merely receiving interactive data transmissions through both receivers is not equivalent to the *receiving schedule* determination method recited in the above listed claims. As such, claims 1, 18 and 38 are allowable for at least this reason.

Additionally, claim 38 recites, *inter alia*, “combining said information from said second signal with content in said first signal.” As discussed in Applicants’ previous response, Tegler does not teach or suggest such a feature. The Office Action alleges that Tegler discloses this feature at col. 3, lines 25 – col. 4, line 5. However, nowhere in the cited passage or Tegler in general, is there any disclosure regarding the combination of information from the cellular signal (i.e., first signal) with content in the broadband signal (i.e., second signal). At most, Tegler discloses using the GSM-network as an interactive channel for distributive services. Still, such a limitation is not comparable to the combination feature recited in claim 38. Claim 38 is thus allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 2-8, 10, 19-21, 39 and 40 are dependent on their respective base independent claims and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, “a controller for configuring said first receiver according to said complementary information.” Contrary to the Office Action’s assertions, Tegler fails to teach or suggest such a feature. While Tegler discloses, at column 3, lines 34-42, that an IC receives instructions from a STB and subsequently transmits such instructions to the DC, nowhere does Tegler teach or suggest that either the IC or DC configures the STB (i.e., a receiver). At most, Tegler discloses that the DC transmits broadband services corresponding to the instructions to the STB. Col. 3, ll. 40-42. Even so, Tegler does not teach or suggest that the STB is configured based on these instructions. As such, claim 2 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Tegler in view of Yuen (WO/0018123). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Yuen discloses a system for two-way communication between a television viewer operating a remote control unit to control a television or other information provider at a central site. *See* Abstract. Yuen thus fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Tegler. As previously discussed, amended independent claims 1, 18 and 38 all relate to determining a receiving schedule of a first receiver of a mobile terminal based on information of a second signal received at a second receiver. Further, the information of the second signal is

complementary to information received via a first signal at the first receiver. Nowhere does Yuen teach or suggest such features. Yuen discloses a set-top box having a pager receiver 14 and an I/R receiver 34. p. 4, ll. 16-29. The I/R receiver 34 receives information such as interactive responses from a remote control unit while the pager receiver 14 receives messages from the information provider. *Id.* Nonetheless, Yuen fails to teach or suggest that a receiving schedule of the pager receiver 14 (i.e., a first receiver) is determined based on information received through the I/R receiver (i.e., a second receiver) or vice versa. Claims 1, 18 and 38 thus overcome the combination of Tegler and Yuen suggested by the Examiner. Additionally, since claim 9 is dependent on claim 1, claim 9 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

New Claims

New claim 45 recites, *inter alia*, “determining a receiving schedule of the first receiver based on the information associated with the second signal, wherein the receiving schedule is related to the operating status of the first receiver.” As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 18 and 38, neither Tegler nor Yuen, separately or in combination, teaches or suggests determining a receiving schedule of the first receiver based on information associated with a second signal, much less that the receiving schedule relates to the operating status of the first receiver. As such claim 45 is allowable over the applied references.

Similarly, new claim 46 recites, *inter alia*, “determining whether the first signal corresponds to instructions to activate a second receiver of the terminal for receiving the second signal from the second communications network; and in response to a positive determination, activating the second receiver.” Again, neither Tegler nor Yuen teaches or suggests, either separately or in combination, such a feature. Nowhere does Tegler or Yuen teach or suggest that a first signal from a first communications network corresponds to instructions to activate a second receiver of a terminal, much less activating the second receiver in response to such instructions. Tegler and Yuen are merely directed to the transmission of telecommunication signals and are unrelated to receiving/operating schedules (i.e., activation, deactivation, standby) of receivers of a mobile terminal or the determination thereof. Claim 46 is thus allowable for at least this reason over the applied references.

Appln. No.: 09/893,890
Amendment dated February 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2005

CONCLUSION


All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 2 day of Feb., 2006

By:


Ross A. Dannenberg,
Registration No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

RAD/CAM